

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 11, 2005. No fee is due for the addition of new claims. A petition for extension of time to respond is enclosed herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 11, 2005, Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 21-32 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18 and 21-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notani (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,149). Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notani in view of Macready et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0016759, hereafter Macready).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1, 3, 11 and 13; cancels Claims 21-32; and adds new Claims 33-44, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 33-44. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed July 11, 2005, Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18 and 21-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notani (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,149).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A collaboration hub for use with a collaboration system for handling messages of conversations among participants, comprising:*
 - a transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to other participants using an extensible data protocol, wherein the extensible data protocol allows a participant to specify both a routing information, and a business protocol, for that conversation, wherein the routing information is specified by the participant in a header of the extensible data protocol, and wherein the business protocol is specified by a uniform resource locator used by the participant to communicate with the transport;*
 - a decoder that decodes messages received from the participants;*
 - a router that validates each message received from a participant at the transport, examines the routing information to determine which others of the participants the message should be delivered to, and stores the message for subsequent delivery via the transport to those participants;*
 - a scheduler that schedules the flow of messages from the transport to the router, and from the router to the transport;*
 - a manager that manages the flow of messages across components of collaboration hub;*
 - a repository that stores management data, wherein said management data is used by components of the collaboration hub to handle said messages; and*
 - wherein support for an additional business protocol can be plugged into the collaboration hub, by specifying the uniform resource locator to be used with the additional business protocol, and the decoder that the additional business protocol will use to decode messages.*

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the collaboration hub as comprising a transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to other participants using an *extensible data protocol*. The extensible data protocol allows a participant to specify both a routing information, and a business protocol, for that conversation, wherein the routing information is specified by the participant in a header of the extensible data protocol, and wherein the business protocol is specified by a *uniform resource locator* (URL) used by the participant to communicate with the transport. Claim 1 has also been amended to defined the hub as comprising a decoder that decodes messages received from the participants; and that support for an additional business protocol can be plugged into the collaboration hub, by specifying the uniform resource locator to be

used with the additional business protocol, and the decoder that the additional business protocol will use to decode messages.

Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited references. In particular, the transport for receiving messages uses an extensible data protocol that provides an ability to specify both a routing information and a business protocol for a conversation. In accordance with this embodiment, the hub provides a unique uniform resource locator (URL) for each business protocol supported by a conversation. Decoders are also provided to allow for flexibility in supporting multiple business protocols. Depending on the business protocol being used by a participant to communicate with the transport, the participant accesses the conversation using a URL assigned to that conversation/business protocol combination. When the collaboration hub receives a message at the appropriate URL, it automatically knows which decoder(s) to use to handle the message. As a result, as long as the participant uses the appropriate URL, then the hub doesn't care which business protocol the participant uses.

Notani discloses a system and process for allowing collaboration within and between enterprises for optimal decision making. Notani appears to disclose a system having a computer implemented process that includes designing a workflow and instantiating the workflow such that at least one activity is tailored to a particular node in the node group. The process then involves deploying the workflow, including distributing the activities over the nodes in the node group, and executing the workflow to provide multi-enterprise collaboration. (Column 2, Lines 16-21). As shown in Figure 5, a global collaboration workspace provides the primary entity used to share data/objects between the various entities in the collaboration. In general, objects can be placed into the global collaboration workspace by one entity, and retrieved by another entity. (Column 5, Lines 20-28).

Applicant respectfully submits that Notani does not appear to disclose or suggest a transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to other participants using an extensible data protocol. Furthermore, Notani does not appear to suggest an extensible data protocol that provides an ability to specify both a routing information and a business protocol for that conversation, wherein the routing information is specified by the participant in a header of the

extensible data protocol, and wherein the business protocol is specified by the URL used by the participant to communicate with the transport.

However in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, as currently amended, the transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to other participants uses an extensible data protocol, wherein the data protocol provides an ability to specify both a routing information and a business protocol for that conversation, using a combination of the header of, and the URL used to communicate with the transport.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Notani, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended similarly to Claim 1, to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 13

Claims 3 and 13 have been amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein as ones in which a plurality of decoders can be used to decode messages received from the participants, wherein each particular business protocol specifies which one or more of the plurality of decoders are to be used with that particular business protocol. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3 and 13 as amended, are neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-6, 8, 14-16 and 18

Claims 4-6, 8, 14-16 and 18 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4-6, 8, 11, 14-16, and

18 are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 21-32

Claims 21-32 have been canceled by the present response, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9 and 19

In the Office Action mailed July 11, 2005, Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notani (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,149) in view of Macready (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0016759).

Claims 9 and 19 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 19 are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

V. Additional Amendments

Claims 33-44 have been added by the present Response. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 33-44 be included in the application, and considered therewith.

Application No.: 09/785,872
Response to Office Action dated: July 11, 2005
Response dated: November 11, 2005

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including November 11, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 11, 2005

By: 

Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800